

Technology Council, and the Catalyst Connection. The article in *The Hill* stated that all four groups share the same address and many of the same officers.

In addition, the Doyle Center handed over a large portion of its earmark money in 2004 to the Catalyst Connection for research. These funds came from a portion of a larger \$1.36 million earmark that make up the center's entire budget for that year.

Just think of that. We are giving an earmark to a center that is funded completely with taxpayer dollars with the goal of receiving more taxpayer dollars.

A certification letter for the project says that \$1.5 million in earmark money will go toward the Doyle Center. But with all these groups sharing the same address, the same money, the same officers, do we really know where the money is going?

So my answer to the sponsor to the earmark is as follows: Is the money going to the Doyle Center, the Pittsburgh Technology Council, the Catalyst Content, Connect, or the Concurrent Technologies?

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me just mention to the gentleman, 85 of the 90 members of the RSC receive, RSC which you just mentioned, receive earmarks in this total of this \$436 million.

Mr. FLAKE. Do you want a response?

Mr. MURTHA. You were using this as an example, the RSC. You were using those as stopping earmarks.

I am just saying that the Members come to the committee. We have a \$459 billion bill. We find all kinds of shortages. I will give you an example of what we just found.

I went down to five bases, sent the staff down later, and we found that they didn't have the money to take the troops back when they come back after BRAC. We put \$3 billion in that. This is an earmark.

Years ago, we put a couple billion in for ships. That is an earmark, and the Navy didn't want them. And yet, the SL-7s, if we wouldn't have had them in 1991, we would not have been able to get there.

We have confidence in the Members. Under the Constitution, Congress is responsible for appropriations. They make recommendations, but it is a bureaucracy that makes recommendations. The President doesn't make recommendations. He sends long lists, the White House sends long lists over to OMB. And anybody that has worked at OMB will tell you, billions of dollars, as the gentleman knows, in requests go to OMB.

I expect the Members to vet them. We try to vet them the best we can. We

know that very few earmarks are not of real value to military. If there is any, we take them out. We have had a few like that, and we take them out as soon as we can.

So I don't make apologies for having earmarks. As I say, \$456 million went to the RSC. So I don't make apologies. That is the Congress' job. Less than 1 percent of the \$459 billion budget in that sense was projects for Members of Congress. And I would think Members of Congress know, as well as the bureaucracy over in the Pentagon and White House know, what needs to be done. And I think the gentleman will have to agree with that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. I don't remember mentioning the RSC, but I appreciate the illumination. But let me just ask the Member, he has talked about the process by which these grants are given.

Let me just note, he mentioned earlier that every one of these was scrubbed by the Appropriations Committee. We had a manager's amendment that actually removed some and then put the money back somewhere else. One in particular that I had planned to actually challenge here was called the Advanced Robotic Vehicle Command and Control. I had an earlier version apparently of what came, and it was removed in a manager's amendment in committee. But then the money was taken, that same money, and given to the same Member for another earmark sponsored by that Member entitled Big Foot Airborne Receiver.

□ 2345

So the money went from that one just to another earmark sponsored by that same Member to plus that one up.

What kind of process does the committee go through? Is it that every Member is allotted a certain amount, or is it what they think the Defense Department needs?

I would be glad to yield to the Member.

Mr. MURTHA. I think that is a perfect example of the way things work. When we see something that we think is not as valuable as something else is, we change it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, there is a story in the paper yesterday that mentioned how much of the funding is in this bill, and the gentleman mentioned that sometimes it is not completely accurate because the Defense Department will ask for things that are then listed as an earmark to the Member. I understand that it is not a perfect count. But still senior members of the Appropriations Committee were given up to \$150 million in earmarks when other rank-and-file Members got maybe a million or 2.

Are there more needs in certain districts? Is it spread out? How does that process go? What confidence should we have as Members voting to fund these earmarks that it is on some kind of

basis that bears any relationship to what the Defense Department needs rather than political calculation?

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

All right. I guess I will accept that as an answer. But let me just say, with regard to the Doyle Center, I would have hoped that the sponsor of the earmark would come and talk about it. But here is another example, as I mentioned, of an earmark incubator where an earmark creates an organization, in this case, named after one of our own, and the same one who it is named after gets more earmarks year after year for the same center to get more earmarks and more Federal contracts.

We simply can't sustain that. The notion that that is what the Defense Department needs simply doesn't hold water. With that, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Lewis Center for Education Research.

(b) CORRESPONDING TRANSFER IN FUNDS.—The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide", and increasing the amount made available for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide", by \$3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a little different from the others. The others would strike funding from the bill. This would simply redirect funding to the same account from which it was drawn.

This amendment would redirect \$3 million from the Lewis Center for Educational Research to the Family Advocacy Programs in the Operations and Maintenance account.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are debating the Labor-HHS bill rather than the Defense appropriations bill.